<u>Amendments to the Drawings</u>:

The attached sheets of replacement drawings include Figs. 1-7. These sheets replace the original sheets, which included Figs. 1-5. Figs. 6 and 7 were previously incorporated by reference.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets (8)

<u>REMARKS</u>

In response to the Advisory Action mailed May 3, 2007, Applicant has filed herewith a Request for Continued Examination in order to secure entry and consideration of this amendment.

Claims 30, 32-36 and 45 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action mailed December 28, 2006, the drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). Claims 30, 33-35, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,067,561 to Dillon ("Dillon") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,848 to Arnold ("Arnold"), and what is well known in the art. Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillon and Arnold in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,644 to Devine et al. ("Devine"). Claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillon and Arnold, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,485 to Homan et al. ("Homan").

On January 5, 2007, Applicant's representative conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner in related Application Serial No. 09/943,894. The Examiner agreed that amending the claims to refer to deleting of a multi-recipient email for an entire group after the email has been sent and accessed by each recipient and none have indicated it was to be saved. In an Office Action mailed April 18, 2007 in the same case, the Examiner noted that ambiguity could be avoided by specifying where the email was saved. In compliance with the Examiner's suggestions, the claims in this case have been amended to recite these limitations.

<u>Objections to the Drawings</u>

The drawings are objected to for failing to include Figures 6 and 7 referenced in the specification. Attached hereto are replacement figures 1-7, including Figures 6 and 7. The added drawings are included in United States Application Serial No. 09/231,158, which is incorporated by reference due to the present application claiming priority thereto as stated in 37 C.F.R. §1.57(a). The added drawings therefore do not constitute new matter.

The drawings are further objected to for failing to illustrate all of the limitations of the claim. Applicant respectfully asserts that the limitations are described in the drawings and specification as filed. However, to expedite prosecution, the limitations giving rise to the objection have been canceled, rendering the objection moot.

Discussion of the Disclosed Embodiment

The embodiments disclosed in the present application will now be discussed in comparison to the cited references. Of course, the discussion of the disclosed embodiments, and the discussion of the differences between the disclosed embodiments and the cited references, does not define the scope or interpretation of any of the claims. Instead, such discussed differences merely help the Examiner appreciate important claim distinctions discussed thereafter.

The present application discloses a method and system for distributing an email communication to multiple recipients while drastically reducing storage space requirements. In one embodiment, an email communication containing an indication of the recipient(s) is received at a server hosting an email communication program. The program makes a determination whether the indication is for multiple recipients. Unlike conventional methods, including those recited in the cited references, the program makes a conditional decision that if the indication is for multiple recipients, the program does not send the email communication to the recipients, but rather centrally stores the email communication on a server, and sends only a short notification of the email communication to each of the multiple recipients without sending the email communication itself. A user may define what information is contained in the notification. Thus, a single copy of the email communication can be stored on a server computer for delivery on an individual basis to multiple recipients when requested. The program does not send the email communication to any recipient until it receives a response from at least one of the recipients that contains a request for the email communication. If the indication is not for multiple recipients the email communication is sent to the recipient without being stored.

Embodiments of the present invention further provide an efficient method for archiving emails. In conventional email systems, an email server is a transitory storage location only, serving to store emails until retrieved. In such systems, archiving takes place on the user's own personal computer or personal storage space on a server. In prior systems, where an email is sent to multiple recipients, each person stores their own copy in their own personal storage space. In one embodiment of the present invention, the email communication program saves a single copy of an email intended for multiple recipients if any of the recipients indicates that it is to be saved, and otherwise deletes the message. In this manner, personal storage space of each

recipient is not required to archive the message. The message is also centrally stored in order to provide access and security not available for messages stored on an individual's workstation or personal storage space.

Discussion of the Cited References

The Examiner has cited the Dillon reference in view of Arnold. Dillon is directed to sending notifications (alerts) of Email messages to recipients using a hybrid network that transmits notifications via a continuous high speed channel. Other than these features and in particular, the features regarding how the alerts are sent, the handling of messages as taught by Dillon is conventional in the art.

Arnold teaches a system that processes messages having attached files. The attached file is stored by the system and the message is forwarded to the recipient along with a pointer used to access the file on the system. Abstract. Where a message has multiple recipients, an access list is associated with the attached file. Col. 4, lns. 25-29. As each user accesses the attached file, the user is deleted from the access list. "Such deletion from the access list may occur at the instruction of the recipient or may occur automatically after the first access (in read only mode) of the attachment ... Once the access list goes to null (i.e., all the intended recipients are deleted from the access list), the attachment is deleted (i.e., removed) from the server." Col. 4, lns. 48-57. Arnold makes no provision for any recipient to indicate that the attached file is to be saved on the server – the message is simply deleted either after the users access the attachment or delete their name from the access list. References to access privileges such as "read only; read and save only; read write and save only," (Col. 5, lns. 40-41), refer to properties of the attachment with respect to a given user, not to actions taken by the server with respect to copies of the attachment stored thereon.

Holman teaches a system in which user may specify by what means notice of a message is to be provided, "[f]or example, a message waiting indicator (MWI) could be set, such as a lamp or a stutter dial tone, an e-mail message can be sent, an outgoing telephone call can be made, and/or a pager can be notified." All of these options simply indicate a means for notifying a user that a message has been received. They do not enable a user to indicate the content of the notification as in the embodiments disclosed by Applicant.

Dillon and Devine fail to remedy the deficiencies of Arnold and Holman.

Discussion of the Claims

Turning now to the claims, the differences between the cited references and the claimed invention will be pointed out.

With respect to claim 30, none of the cited references, whether alone or in combination, teach all of the limitations of the claim, including "saving the Email communication on the server if any one of the recipients indicate it is to be saved; and when it is determined that the Email communication has been sent and accessed by all of the recipients, deleting the stored Email communication by the Email communication program if none of the recipients indicate it is to be saved."

With respect to claim 36, none of the cited references, whether alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claim, including a method "wherein contents of the received Email communication notification are based on preferences for the one of the plurality of designated recipients, the preferences previously supplied to the server configured with the Email communication program."

With respect to claim 45, none of the cited references, whether alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claim, including a method including the steps of "saving the Email communication on the server if any one of the recipients indicate it is to be saved; and when it is determined that the Email communication has been sent and accessed by all of the recipients, deleting the stored Email communication by the Email communication program if none of the recipients indicate it is to be saved."

The claims depending from the above-discussed independent claims are also patentable because of their dependency from patentable independent claims and because of the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

All of the claims in the application are clearly allowable. Favorable consideration and a timely Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Michael G. Pate
Registration No. 53,439
Telephone No. (206) 903-2398

MGP:sp

Enclosures:
    Postcard
    Check
    Fee Transmittal Sheet (+ copy)
    Replacement Drawing Sheets (8 Sheets; Figs. 1-7)

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3400
Seattle, WA 98101-4010
(206) 903-8800 (telephone)
(206) 903-8820 (fax)

h:\ip\clients\micron technology\200\500247.03\500247.03 response aa 050307.doc